

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT TACOMA

## KIEM DUC LE,

Plaintiff,

V.

INTEL CORPORATION,

Defendant.

Case No. C06-5458FDB

## ORDER OF DISMISSAL

On November 1, 2006, the Court allowed Plaintiff's counsel to withdraw. Plaintiff was to notify the Court whether he would employ new counsel or proceed pro se, and Plaintiff advised the Court in writing on November 20, 2006 that he would proceed pro se. Plaintiff also indicated that he would be out of the country between December 20, 2006 and February 4, 2007. On November 27, 2006, the Court issued orders concerning dates for initial disclosures and for filing a joint status report, mediation, and discovery. None of the deadlines fell within the period that Plaintiff would be out of the country, and the docket indicates that Plaintiff was mailed copies of the aforementioned orders.

A plaintiff is charged with the duty of prosecuting his case and with abiding by the Court's orders whether represented by counsel or proceeding pro se. Plaintiff has demonstrated that he is

## ORDER - 1

1 capable of responding to the Court's Orders. Plaintiff has demonstrated no good cause for his lack  
2 of attention to this case other than to state that he did not know about the deadline. On this  
3 showing, the Court will dismiss this case for failure to show cause why it should not be dismissed for  
4 failure to prosecute.

5 NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED: This cause of action is DISMISSED for failure to  
6 prosecute.

7 DATED this 6<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2007.

8   
9  
10 FRANKLIN D. BURGESS  
11 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26